



Bridgewater State University Virtual Commons - Bridgewater State University

Honors Program Theses and Projects

Undergraduate Honors Program

5-14-2014

The Past is Present: Exploring Methods of Cooperation Between Archaeologists, Native Americans, and Museums in Southern New England

McKayla Hoffman

Follow this and additional works at: http://vc.bridgew.edu/honors_proj



Part of the [Anthropology Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Hoffman, McKayla. (2014). The Past is Present: Exploring Methods of Cooperation Between Archaeologists, Native Americans, and Museums in Southern New England. In *BSU Honors Program Theses and Projects*. Item 54. Available at: http://vc.bridgew.edu/honors_proj/54
Copyright © 2014 McKayla Hoffman

This item is available as part of Virtual Commons, the open-access institutional repository of Bridgewater State University, Bridgewater, Massachusetts.

The Past is Present: Exploring Methods of Cooperation Between Archaeologists, Native
Americans, and Museums in Southern New England

McKayla Hoffman

Submitted in Partial Completion of the
Requirements for Departmental Honors in Anthropology

Bridgewater State University

May 14, 2014

Dr. Curtiss Hoffman, Thesis Director
Dr. Michael Zimmerman, Committee Member
Dr. Joyce Rain Anderson, Committee Member

Homo sapiens sapiens is arguably one of the most fascinating and complex species that has ever existed on Earth. On the surface, we appear to be highly diversified, and we interpret the world around us in a variety of ways. These interpretations shape the way that we live our lives on this planet, and inform our wide array of kinship patterns, marriage ceremonies, languages, religious beliefs, and more. However, for all of these differences, we are the same at our core: we contain relatively the same DNA, and might generally share similar goals and aspirations for ourselves and those we share their lives with. Therefore, if we are to understand each other and perhaps build a more understanding world, it might be wise to consider shifting our focus from the differences which separate us to the similarities which bind us.

Anthropology is a valuable field because, ultimately, it is capable of dissolving our ideas about how cultural differences separate us to allow us to function more effectively as a globalized world, by respecting and maintaining cultural differences. As a subfield of anthropology in the United States, archaeology might strive to advocate for and practice the same.

However, archaeologists in the United States have not always exercised such cultural sensitivity, for example, in Southern New England. The arrival of the Europeans to the “New World” set into motion a complex history which would result in the differing worldviews of archaeologists and Native Americans. As non-Native individuals grew more interested in the pre-contact history of Southern New England, an emphasis on science and the thrill of discovery grew at the expense of any interest in or respect for the rich cultures of the by-then decimated and assimilated Native communities. Museums joined the fray, as a need for artifact storage and a desire to educate the public expanded. However, oftentimes the Native perspective was ignored in favor of the archaeologists’ or the curators’ perspective in exhibit design, thus further skewing

the history presented to the public, which contributed to perpetuating the stereotypical image of Native Americans in the United States. Eventually, important changes were made after new legislation was passed and important discourse about Native American cultural heritage and treatment began. It is an intricate history of self-interests clashing with spiritual beliefs that continues today and still has room for further evolution.

In this thesis, my goal is to present the voices of archaeologists, Native peoples, and museum authorities in the most authentic voice possible. While this might appear to render the piece less academic, it is nonetheless important to consider these stories, experiences, and opinions precisely as they have been expressed, to come as close as possible to devising models of cooperation that are tailored to the unique concerns of each stakeholder. Effective collaboration is not simply a kind gesture, but a requirement for the proper treatment of cultural materials and it will strengthen scientific rigor in archaeological research rather than weakening it.

Historical Context

A discussion of the complex history of cooperation between archaeologists, Native Americans, and museums in Southern New England can only begin with the arrival of Europeans to the New World. European settlers—specifically English explorers and mercantilists—arrived in the New World during the early 1600’s and brought with them not only their desire to obtain raw materials to bring back to their home countries, but also their Christian beliefs and the interpretations of the world around them through that lens (Atalay 2006: 280-310). As time went on, an interest grew in the history of the New World. Inevitably, the archaeology of America grew out of the Western tendency to categorize and objectify the past, something that was hardly a concept for Native Americans at the time (Atalay 2006: 280-310). A scientific and aesthetic

appreciation grew for artifacts, and antiquarians, collectors, anthropologists, and archaeologists emerged (Atalay 2006: 280-310). Early North American archaeology was conducted after the Revolutionary War in a non-scientific manner by middle- and upper-class men not necessarily for educational purposes, but either for monetary gain or to satisfy curiosity (Atalay 2006: 280-310). Colonization not only denied Native Americans autonomy and basic human rights, but also effectively their heritage.

When attempting to understand the archaeological remains they came across, settlers rarely attributed their creation to the Natives at that time. Petroglyphs discovered across North America were considered to be Norse runes or attributed to the ancient Egyptians, Phoenicians, and Celts; other archaeological finds were assumed to have been evidence of occupation by the “Lost Tribes of Israel” (Downer 1997: 25, 26). Thomas Jefferson, often deemed the “father of American archaeology,” undertook detailed excavations of large mounds, and after careful study of the bone materials found there, he concluded that they were burial mounds (Atalay 2006: 280-310). His findings contributed to putting the myth of the “mound-building race”—a group of people who were not Native American—to rest, and his work also demonstrated the potential for utilizing the scientific method in archaeology. Unfortunately, Jefferson’s motivations did not align with the needs and desires of the Native communities, nor to those of the citizens of the new republic who wanted to acquire new land who used the mysterious moundbuilder race theory to do so. He realized that these mounds were significant to Native Americans, yet did nothing to acknowledge this and excluded them from his studies (Atalay 2006: 280-310).

One of the more notable European theories was of the mysterious race of “mound builders,” whom they believed were responsible for the construction of mounds in the Midwest, mid-South, and Southeast regions (Downer 1997: 26). Who this race of mound builders was

exactly was a highly debated topic that culminated in 1881 when John Wesley Powell charged the Bureau of American Ethnology with considering the issue. Meanwhile, Cyrus Thomas, an archaeologist at the time and the director of the Smithsonian, compiled an intensely detailed report of archaeological research on mounds under the direction of Powell, effectively debunking the myth that Native Americans did not build these mounds. This idea nonetheless survived for some outside of the archaeological community (Downer 1997: 28). This dealt a powerful blow to pervading racism between Euro-Americans and Native Americans, and set the stage for a shift in thinking and treatment of Native culture and heritage.

A Consideration of Legislation

As continuous pressure was placed upon archaeologists and antiquarians to acknowledge and respect Native American heritage, important federal legislation was written that would make archaeology more sensitive and responsible.

During the late 19th century into the 20th century, pot hunting for profit, private collections, and for museum procurement became an increasingly common occurrence. At the same time, archaeologists and anthropologists were dissatisfied with the amount of protection for these artifacts (Downer 1997: 28). Thus, the Antiquities Act of 1906 was written and passed under Theodore Roosevelt's administration, and established a number of important protective measures for historical sites and artifacts. Firstly, the Act prohibits the excavation, destruction, or appropriation of any historic or—notably—prehistoric sites, ruins, and objects on federal lands, and established a fine of \$500, imprisonment, or both to those parties found guilty (American Antiquities Act 1906: 431-433). The Act also gives the President the authority to declare sites on federal land that are of historic and scientific interest to be historic landmarks—or national parks—which laid the groundwork for historic preservation on a broader scale and for the

establishment of the National Park Service in the same year (American Antiquities Act 1906: 431-433).

While these statutes provided a firm foundation for historic preservation., one potentially dangerous line of language in this Act reads: "...when such objects are situated upon a tract covered by a bona fide unperfected claim or held in private ownership, the tract, or so much thereof as may be necessary for the proper care and management of the object, may be relinquished to the Government" (American Antiquities Act: 431-433). By the 20th century, most land that Native Americans tribes across the United States considered their homeland was taken, and artifacts from such land were not considered to be their property, but that of those who discovered them. This Act essentially prevents Native Americans from claiming any rightful ownership of the items because when pothunters are caught looting a site, the government immediately seizes such artifacts and claim them without regard for how Native communities would react. Another provision which might have a similar effect states that artifacts found in a permitted excavation must be stored in museums permanently (American Antiquities Act: 431-433). Here, Native Americans are again not considered in the scope of historic preservation, but rather, the focus is on archaeologists, educational institutions such as universities and museums, and the government. For the aforementioned reasons, even though Native history was in a way being preserved under the Antiquities Act of 1906, it was done so based on the terms that non-Natives had created and is therefore problematic.

Between 1906 and the 1960's, even after the aforementioned legislation was enacted, archaeological sites continued to be looted and destroyed. The Antiquities Act established consequences for pot hunting on federal land and worked to formalize archaeological projects legally, but ultimately, the Act failed to provide full protection for sites not on federal lands and

historical sites due to an increase in the commercialization of archaeological materials. To combat this, the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) was passed. This statute legitimized the importance of historic places legally, including archaeological sites, and enabled the preservation of such resources to occur within public institutions and at all levels of government: federal, state, and local (NHPA 1966: 16 U.S.C. 470). Another noteworthy feature of this law is that it establishes the positions of State Historic Preservation Officers (SHPOs) and, after the revision in the 1980's, Tribal Historic Preservation Officers (THPOs), the latter allowing greater representation for Native Americans' historic—and perhaps cultural—preservation that had not previously existed (NHPA 1966: 16 U.S.C. 470).

One section of NHPA which revolutionized public archaeology is Section 106, which established the National Register of Historic Places, a listing of properties, districts, or buildings that are deemed historically and culturally significant under specified criteria (NHPA 1966: 16 U.S.C. 470). A site is considered eligible for nomination by the keeper of the National Register; the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation becomes involved if there is a dispute between parties over the eligibility of the site. The creation of the National Register provided a level of protection for sites that had never been used before, because under NHPA, the Advisory Council can comment on whether a project might have adverse effects on a site that is eligible for listing on the Register. This has allowed for thousands of archaeological investigations to take place following NHPA's passage in 1966 (NPS Archeology Program). Under this law, a Native American pre-contact site which is eligible for listing on the Register can receive additional protection that the Antiquities Act of 1906 did not provide.

One point that is worth noting is that the criteria listed in NHPA for defining National Register eligibility are usually helpful for most sites, but when it comes to pre-contact Native

North American sites, it can be construed as problematic. For example, under criterion (b), a site can be nominated to the National Register if a figure of historical importance has a connection to the site (NHPA 1966: 16 U.S.C. 470). One might argue that historical importance is rendered differently cross-culturally, not to mention that historic significance of pre-contact figures can be difficult to determine due to the lack of materials at such sites that might indicate the presence—and the identity—of a specific individual. Criteria (c) (the site represents a specific period or method of creation), (d) (the site contains information that is important to understanding “prehistory” or history), and (a) in limited cases (the site has made significant contributions to history) might apply well to these types of sites, and often does (NHPA 1966: 16 U.S.C. 470). This legislation markedly improved the government’s ability to mitigate any adverse impact from which an archaeological site might otherwise suffer.

While the Antiquities Act and NHPA provided a greater measure of protection for archaeological sites, and even though a position was later established that would allow for greater representation for Native communities, there were farther-reaching issues that needed to be attended to in Native communities. Ironically, due to the existing federal and state laws, Native Americans were limited in the ways in which they could exercise their religious rights. They lacked ceremonial space that was legal to use (in most cases, that was not public property), they were not able to utilize certain ceremonial items, such as body parts of protected animal species (e.g. eagle feathers and bones) or peyote in the case of the Native American Church, and they often found their private ceremonies interrupted by curious onlookers (Vecsey 32). As a result, many Native Americans realized that the freedom of religion as outlined in the Constitution did not apply to them, and lobbied for greater protection of their rights. Movements

like the American Indian Movement, or AIM, created a climate among tribes across the United States to advocate for the preservation of their heritage, land, and rights (“AIM Movement”).

Finally, their efforts reached fruition when the American Indian Religious Freedom Act, or AIRFA, passed on August 11, 1978 ("American Indian Religious Freedom Act"). With this important legislation in place, for the first time, protections were put into place so that Native Americans across the United States could continue ceremonial practices without legal interference ("American Indian Religious Freedom Act"). Quite significantly, AIRFA guaranteed Native tribes the right to conduct ceremonies at important religious sites that they otherwise could not, usually because such sites were—and still are—located on federal land ("American Indian Religious Freedom Act"). For many years after its passage, Natives cited AIRFA in cases that involved protecting sacred sites and objects, something they could not do before.

For all the betterments this legislation was intended to provide, it was not perfect. About ten years after the act was passed, the *Lyng v. Northwest Indian Cemetery Protect Association* Supreme Court case took place. The United States Forest Service completed an environmental impact statement for the construction of a paved road in the Six Rivers National Forest that would be constructed in an area used for religious ceremony by local tribes (Cornell University Law School). The Court determined that from a federal land management standpoint, the language of AIRFA was only meant to be a policy statement instead of a law that Natives could cite to actively protect this area ("American Indian Religious Freedom Act"). The limitations of the Act that were discovered in this case prompted the creation of an American Indian Religious Freedom Coalition (AIRFC) who worked to convince Congress to amend the Act. While this group could not push Congress to add amendments to AIRFA right away, in 1992, they did inevitably add one important amendment to NHPA: they defined “properties of traditional

religious and cultural importance to an Indian tribe” as being eligible for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places ("American Indian Religious Freedom Act"). This important change was not only a significant advancement for the protection of sacred sites, but also for the practice of archaeology.

The passage of these pieces of legislation spurred a swift and powerful movement into a new era of historical and cultural preservation. Successful lobbying on the part of Native American activists for the legally-binding protections for what they consider most sacred was integral to providing tribes with agency over their heritage. However, this time was also one marked by an ever-growing tension between tribes and archaeologists, both of whom had vastly differing opinion about the ownership and management of the past. So far, quite a bit of emphasis has been placed upon the impact this legislation has had on Native communities, but it is important to also consider the impact archaeologists have felt and how it adds to this discourse.

As archaeology developed into the discipline it is today in the United States, it was seen by its practitioners as being a hugely positive field of study. For example, when it came to studying skeletal remains—which carry great spiritual and cultural significance for tribes, archaeologists argued that their work was shedding light on significant details of Native American history such as the diets, disease, and everyday activities of their ancient ancestors. They pointed out that their scientific research was contributing to Native American knowledge of their own past and at times enabled tribes to make land claims that they might not have been able to otherwise (Downer 1997: 30). Archaeologists saw their work—perhaps rightfully at times—as being entirely beneficial for all parties involved. When it came to Native Americans lobbying for new legislation, many archaeologists believed they were doing it for political recognition and did

not understand their true intentions, especially because the new legislation made it more difficult to do archaeological investigations unimpeded (Downer 1997: 30).

Another issue that was significant for both archaeologists and Native communities was curation, and this began a heated discourse about the nature of archaeological investigations and about Native American ownership of their heritage. Archaeologists advocated for the preservation of cultural materials by, among other ways, excavating, processing and documenting such materials in a lab setting, and curating them in a museum. In this way, the materials are preserved for study by future archaeologists who might be more knowledgeable about what has been found. However, members of the Native community felt as though the cultural and skeletal remains of their ancestors were being objectified and mistreated as they sat in cardboard boxes collecting dust in a museum basement. One might argue that it was this particular area of contention that spurred this discourse, which involved misguided intentions, the fact that the word “preservation” connotes something different for the various stakeholders in the past, and, at times, a clash between the nature of Western science and Native American spirituality.

Another act was signed in 1990 which would not only change the face of relations between archaeologists and Native Americans, but would also spark heated controversy. According to the Department of the Interior, the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act, otherwise known as NAGPRA, “provides a process for museums and Federal agencies to return certain Native American cultural items—human remains, funerary objects, sacred objects, or objects of cultural patrimony—to lineal descendants, and culturally affiliated Indian tribes and Native Hawaiian organizations” (“NAGPRA”). NAGPRA takes effect when archaeologists stumble upon grave goods and human remains during excavation, as well as when

museums obtain human remains and grave goods. This also applies to federally-funded museums that obtained NAGPRA-sensitive collections before the passing of the legislation. Under NAGPRA, archaeologists are granted a limited amount of time to analyze such finds before they have to be repatriated, or returned, to the Native groups to which they belong, as long as the group claims them; following this, there is an adjudicatory process. This time limit also applies to how long museums are permitted to store these sensitive items ("NAGPRA"). This act operates the most effectively when the remains can be traced back to a specific Native group; nevertheless, there are provisions in the act that ensure that materials which cannot be traced are handled in the most sensitive way possible ("NAGPRA"). The act also works to cease illegal trafficking of grave goods and remains, as well as both inadvertent and planned discoveries of these items ("NAGPRA"). At face value, one might be under the impression that NAGPRA's provisions are fool-proof in protecting and fully repatriating Native remains and grave goods. However, many disagreements have arisen between Native groups, archaeologists, museum personnel, government officials, and other parties involved.

This dialogue inspired many formal meetings between archaeologists, museum personnel, and various members of Native communities. One such meeting was organized in 1989 by G. Peters Jemison, a member of the Seneca Nation and the site manager for the Ganondagan State Historic Site, and it was held at the State University of New York (SUNY) Buffalo. Some of the discussants invited included museum personnel from the Rochester Museum and Science Center (including Martha Sempowski, an archaeologist, Lorraine Saunders, a physical anthropologist, and Charles Hayes III), Native Americans (including Chief Irving Powless Jr. of the Onondaga Nation, professor John Mohawk of the Seneca Nation, and Longhouse elder Geraldine Green of the Seneca Nation) (Jemison 1997: 58). The root of the

controversy about this issue began a year before NAGPRA was signed, while it was still being drafted. In response to this contention, in 1989, G. Peter Jemison—then a graduate student at SUNY Buffalo—organized a seminar entitled “Who Owns the Past?” The goal of the seminar was, in Jemison’s words, to “examine our differing views of human remains and sacred objects” (Jemison 1997: 58). He recorded the seminar, which allows its readers to delve into this issue. Jemison invited elders, professors, museum personnel, a research director, an archaeologist accompanied by a research fellow, and a physical anthropologist also accompanied by a research fellow to debate this issue. Upon analyzing the two sides, one might begin to understand the true complexity of this issue, as well as the long-term implications it will have on both historic and cultural preservation and on the rocky relationship between archaeologists and Native Americans in the Northeast.

During the “Who Owns the Past?” seminar, many experts in the field of anthropology and archaeology shared their opinions about some potential shortcomings of NAGPRA, specifically when it came to repatriation. Lorraine Sanders, a physical anthropologist, described the possible ill-effects of the repatriation of Native remains upon their valuable historical record. She stated: “The sort of study that I do involves direct contact with these people individual by individual. The information...comes directly from each person. In that way, it seems to me that I am giving them the opportunity to have some say in what is known about them today” (Jemison 1997: 58). While her comments illustrate her opposition to repatriation, Sanders’ statement reveals the scientific value of physical anthropology in adding to an indigenous historical record, because it provides information about Native ancestors that cannot be learned from artifacts, such as their health and their diets. Martha Sempowski, an archaeologist, shared Sanders’ opinion, and illuminated a point about another potential danger that might result from

repatriation. She says: “Repatriating would make private collections extremely rare, and therefore, the monetary value of these items would increase” (Jemison 1997: 59). Sempowski’s point about the monetary value of artifacts increasing is an important one, because it was the perspective of many archaeologists at that time that with demand and the desire for money comes looting, which might defeat the purpose of repatriation in the eyes of some. However, to the Native community, the commodification of their people’s remains is disturbing and completely ignores the spiritual and emotional ties that this community has with their ancestors.

While some of the experts in the field offered valuable insight into the negative aspects of NAGPRA, members of the Native community gave equally compelling arguments. During the seminar, many chose to focus their attention not only on the repatriation of remains, but on the spiritual significance that sacred objects have to Native groups, and the fact that repatriation of these items is also necessary. Chief Irving Powless of the Onondaga nation indicated the following: “We are the ones that know how to use them... You do not know the purpose of these sacred objects. They do not belong in a box in a museum or some art show... these sacred objects should be in our possession, not in the possession of some anthropologist, archaeologist, or some museum or private collector” (Jemison 1997: 59). John Mohawk of the Seneca nation expounded upon Powless’ sentiments towards museums and cooperation with archaeologists when he stated: “...I am personally in favor of more archaeological research and not less... What I’m opposed to is the continuation of museums as monuments to ethnocentrism in our culture” (Jemison 1997: 60). Mohawk also made a telling rebuttal towards Saunders about the repatriation of remains when he stated: “When you argue that the bones that our people left there are useful, more useful for scientific purposes than they are necessary for reburial to maintain the heart and essence of the culture... you’re making an ethnocentric argument” (Jemison 1997: 61). Both of these men

clearly had sincere concerns about balancing their own spiritual beliefs with the concerns of physical anthropologists and archaeologists, who in their scientific pursuits were missing some of the deepest concerns of Native communities.

Jemison's record of the debates in this seminar continued on, and it might become evident to any reader that the contention between the Natives, archaeologists, and anthropologists was fierce during this seminar. A reader of Jemison's record might conclude that in reality, neither Native Americans nor archaeologists determine who owns the past in this country, but rather the provisions of NAGPRA. Even though this act has been in place for over two decades, its progress towards nurturing the relationship between Natives and archaeologists has been slow.

Great Falls: A Case Study in Cooperation

More recently, the issue of cooperation between Native Americans and archaeologists in Southern New England continues, particularly when sensitive sites are discovered. One particularly notable site in Turners Falls, Massachusetts was the subject of a film entitled "Great Falls: Discovery, Destruction and Preservation in a Massachusetts Town" (*Great Falls*). The film described the site's controversial nature, and that it set a precedent for a potential model of cooperation that was considered ideal for those involved, even though there were some significant challenges involved.

Stone ceremonial landscapes have been the focus of a great deal of controversy in the Northeast culture area, and the Turners Falls site is no exception. Turners Falls, located in northern central Massachusetts, has been a significant place to Native Americans in the area for thousands of years. In the film *Great Falls*, Doug Harris, the former deputy Tribal Historic Preservation Officer (THPO) for the Narragansett tribe, describes that the rivers that flow

through town—the Millers River, the Connecticut River, and the Deerfield River—flow south, east, and west, which are three of the four cardinal directions that are symbolic to Native Americans. It was also believed to be a center of gathering for the ancestors of today's Pocumtucks, Narragansetts, and others who would meet and hold ceremony to maintain peace between the tribes and “with the Earth and the Creator” (*Great Falls*).

According to the *Great Falls* film, in 2004, the town and the Narragansett tribe decided to hold a ceremony of reconciliation to settle the conflict that had occurred there and to begin new dialogue between the two groups. The Medicine Man and THPO of the Narragansetts, John Brown, did a burying of the hatchet ceremony and the smoking of the pipe with the three select board members of Turners Falls. Thereafter, they each signed an accord declaring a partnership between them, and the town of Turners Falls made a promise that they would do whatever was necessary to protect Native American historical resources (*Great Falls*). This was seen as a powerful event, and as Doug Harris explained, “it was the first of its type with that kind of partnership in writing, signatures, and in ceremonial deed,” and it set a precedent for cooperation in the area (*Great Falls*).

A short time after the ceremony of reconciliation was performed, a five million dollar grant was given to the town of Turners Falls to expand their airport's runway. One side of this runway would be situated on a sandy ridge known as the “Hanneman Site,” where several encampments were discovered whose individual dates ranged from 12,000 to 2,000 BP (*Great Falls*). A decision was made to avoid construction on this side of the runway, but when they turned to the other end of it, they discovered something significant. The other end of the runway met a higher, wooded slope where Harris and archaeologist Howard Clark discovered stone piles under leaf debris. After some careful consideration, a determination was made that this stone

piles was but one example of the ceremonial stone landscapes which dot the Northeastern region of the United States.

Even though this area was left alone, this did not impede the continuation of the project in the surrounding area. The Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) granted permission to move forward with construction of the runway. Soon after, the project proponent realized that a multitude of surrounding trees would have to be removed to proceed, and protest from the Natives in the area proved fruitless (*Great Falls*). The impact of this construction was significant: machinery for this job clear-cut the trees that grew where the Turners Falls site was located, and it revealed other surrounding ceremonial stones, including a “Manitou” stone that was found in a rut (*Great Falls*). These stones are of particular importance to Native peoples, because they are believed to house the spirit, or the “Manitou,” of any beings that have ever lived. This includes their ancestors, which makes these stones especially sensitive. Later on, Cheryl Andrews Maltais—the former THPO for the Wampanoag Gay Head tribe and their current chief—and Doug Harris did a survey of the area. They discovered that these stones, which had significant archaeoastronomical alignments, had been disturbed by the clear-cut of the area (*Great Falls*). It was a disturbing event for the Native Americans in the area to witness, especially for those like Doug Harris, who had advocated so fiercely for the protection of such sites.

The agreement made between the select board of Turners Falls and the Native community stated that the town of Turners Falls would help to protect Native American historical resources, and thankfully, the stone landscape found was, in fact, protected. Another notable outcome to this occurred in 2008, when the Turners Falls site that the town did help preserve was recognized as eligible for the National Register of Historic Places, and it became

the first ceremonial stone landscape in the United States to receive such recognition. Even though the Turners Falls site had been damaged, it being added to the National Register was an important victory for both the tribe, the town, and for the future of their collaborative relationship.

When cases such as this one become steeped in emotional and religious investment, the task of mitigating physical damage and damage to a once collaborative relationship might just fall on the shoulders of archaeologists. Harris pointed out in the *Great Falls* film that he believes it is the job of the “scientists,” or the archaeologists, to decide upon a method to determine when ceremony was established at such sites. Perhaps, though, the responsibility could also fall on the Native Americans in the area who can offer their insight and cultural knowledge. This case exemplifies the possibility that stakeholders can come together and truly honor the agreement they made in the beginning, even in the face of adversity.

Project Methodology

What has been considered thus far is an overview and analysis of the history of collaboration between primarily Native Americans and archaeologists. For the main component of this thesis, with the help of my thesis advisor, Dr. Curtiss Hoffman, I compiled a list of archaeologists, museum officials, and members of Native communities who were advocates of cooperating to preserve the past, specifically when it comes to pre-contact Native American sites in Southern New England, and who had all taken part in some collaborative effort. My goal was to conduct in-depth interviews with as many informants as possible to learn from their experiences and to extract important or overlapping ideas or experiences to create models of cooperation that can be realistically utilized. In total, I have interviewed eleven informants who fall into the category of archaeologist, museum personnel, and/or Native community member:

Elizabeth Chilton (archaeologist and museum personnel), Stephen Silliman (archaeologist), Stephen Mrozowski (archaeologist), Christina Rieth (archaeologist and museum personnel), Jordan Kerber (archaeologist and museum personnel), Timothy Ives (archaeologist), Rae Gould (archaeologist, museum personnel, and Nipmuc), Arthur Spiess (archaeologist), Kenneth Alves (Assonet Wampanoag), Kenneth's friend Don Blake (Assonet Wampanoag), and Joyce Rain Anderson (Wampanoag and museum personnel). I interviewed the aforementioned informants from November 2013 until the end of April 2014. I took notes during the interview and recorded them with the consent of the interviewees.

Issues to Consider

The main issue which I should underscore is that I had great difficulty in successfully contacting and interviewing members of the Native community in the area. My original intent was to interview an equal number of museum personnel, archaeologists, and Native Americans. This may therefore create a sampling bias among my informants, due to the larger percentage of archaeology informants I interviewed.

Interviews

The first three informants I will describe are members of the Wampanoag Nation and the Nipmuc Nation, and are from various bands.

Kenneth Alves and Don Blake

The first two informants that I interviewed for this project were Kenny Alves, the Repatriation Officer for the Assonet band of the Wampanoag Nation, and Don Blake, his "advisor and right hand man." We had a wonderfully long and thought-provoking conversation, so I will outline some of the main points they made. When I asked how they would characterize the relationship between Native groups and archaeologists in Massachusetts, they both told me

that a lot has changed over the years. Relations were “touch-and-go” at first. Kenny said that early in his relationship with archaeologists, he found that they were far more interested in the artifacts and the data and not in the concerns of the Native community. However, he explained that there are many archaeologists from younger generations in the area that are beginning to work side-by-side with Native stakeholders during their projects.

During our conversation, both Don and Kenny continually emphasized the important issues related to burials and control of information. They both expressed that their tribe would ideally want artifacts to remain in the ground because this is the resting place of their ancestors. We began discussing NAGPRA, and Kenny asked this notable question that cemented their perspective in my mind: “Why did it take a law for you [for archaeologists] to have feelings?”

They also pointed out that many Wampanoags would prefer that information pertaining to ceremonial practices discovered in the archaeological record—or not—be kept secret, and they felt that they should rightfully have the final say about whether this information is published or not.

However, the items coming out of the ground weren’t even the most significant concern they discussed. Don told me one interesting story from his youth: during his childhood, he would often visit the Dartmouth Historical Museum. At one point, he saw an exhibition displaying grave goods from a Wampanoag princess. When Don asked me “How am I supposed to feel about my ancestor in a case?”, it drove home for me the very negative feelings that he and other Native peoples felt about the pre-NAGPRA days in which such artifacts could be put on display. This seemed to instill within Don a negative attitude towards museums and archaeologists, and perhaps rightfully so.

It seemed as though Don and Kenny's views on this subject were shaped during events that occurred many years ago, but they are each pleased with the direction in which this issue is moving. Kenny ended the conversation by mentioning his view that archaeologists are bound by institutions that aren't bound to the Native community or—especially—the Native communities that existed thousands of years ago, and that receiving a doctoral degree does not mean that one knows more than the people they are studying.

Dr. Rae Gould

Another informant I will speak about is a unique figure in this issue. Dr. Rae Gould is all of the stakeholders I considered in my research combined: she is a repatriation coordinator at UMass Amherst, an expert in historical archaeology, and is the Tribal Historic Preservation Officer of the Nipmuc Nation. She has been a key consultant with her colleagues at UMass Amherst and has been a consultant for Nipmuc projects such as the Sarah Boston homesite, a praying village from the 1600s.

During our interview, she explained to me that in her experience, while burials are always a sensitive issue, collaboration can be “mutually respectful and beneficial in that both people are learning a lot.” She advised that for effective collaboration, there must be communication from the beginning. Also, she pointed out that many archaeologists believe collaborative work with Native communities involves having a hypothesis, coming up with a research design, and perhaps relying upon Native interpretations, but no more. She emphasized the importance of recognizing the needs and interests of tribes while doing an archaeological project. From her Nipmuc perspective, Dr. Gould explained to me that archaeology is valuable in that it provides another layer of information that can give more insight into understanding the past.

One important idea that I should note from this discussion was one Dr. Gould made towards the end of our conversation. She emphasized the fact that the stark “us versus them” view that exists between archaeologists and Native Americans is slowly beginning to erode. This point made me greatly reconsider my pre-conceptions about this issue. If the different stakeholders being considered in this research all fit into the professional career and life of one individual like Dr. Gould, perhaps then truly collaborative projects could occur.

Dr. Joyce Rain Anderson

Dr. Anderson is a full time professor of English and is the director of the U.S. Ethnic and Indigenous Studies minor at Bridgewater State University. She has worked extensively with a number of groups through her research on material rhetorics, including the Nipmuc, the Massachusetts, the Wampanoag, the Narragansett, and the Abenaki. She has been a consultant for an NEH grant project at the Robbins Museum of Archaeology in Middleborough, Massachusetts, and teaches various courses on Native writing and rhetoric. She has Wampanoag ancestry, but is not officially enrolled as a tribal member (Joyce Rain Anderson, McKayla Hoffman, 21 April 2014).

During our interview, Dr. Anderson reflected on the contentious history between archaeologists and Native Americans. She critiqued the tendency in early American anthropology to tell people “what they are and who they are” (Joyce Rain Anderson, McKayla Hoffman, 21 April 2014). She explained that while anthropologists today are far more respectful in that they listen rather than tell, there is still lingering distrust towards them among Native communities, because many Natives did not appreciate the fact that their story was told by another group of people. Dr. Anderson said that the more recent generations are more willing to

trust anthropologists and archaeologists than elders, but “generational trauma and historical distrust...is still very prevalent” (Joyce Rain Anderson, McKayla Hoffman, 21 April 2014).

Dr. Anderson’s opinion about archaeology was that if there is purpose in what research is being conducted beyond excavation, effective collaboration is more likely to occur. Examples she gave of such purpose consisted of archaeologists helping Natives to establish land claims and even federal recognition through the results of their research. She also emphasized the importance of a sustained relationship not just between archaeologists and local tribes, but between archaeologists and the land; if archaeologists can gain a respect for the preservation (and not just excavation) of land, this might allow them to have greater empathy towards their Native partners (Joyce Rain Anderson, McKayla Hoffman, 21 April 2014). Dr. Anderson also conveyed to me that many archaeologists do not completely respect the beliefs that Natives have about how they first appeared on the landscape. This is also compounded by an elitist attitude on the part of some archaeologists throughout history: that with a doctorate comes a knowledge that Natives could not possibly have. Exercising a cultural relativist perspective when it comes to respecting these beliefs can also enable archaeologists to respect the Native perspective about land and Native history and create a respectful climate for cooperation.

When it comes to the control of information between archaeologists, Native communities, and museums, Dr. Anderson emphasized the fact that all should share agency by maintaining consistent communication with one another about archaeological projects, exhibit designing, and educational ventures. Each stakeholder should view each other not as an interference or a nuisance, but as “allies” (Joyce Rain Anderson, McKayla Hoffman, 21 April 2014).

Dr. Anderson stressed the need for all parties to work together to make pre-contact Native American history relevant for the public. In museums, she recommended that an institution “take an artifact and put it on display, but give it a life—give it a story” (Joyce Rain Anderson, McKayla Hoffman, 21 April 2014). Archaeologists and museums are often responsible for educating the public, and Dr. Anderson said these positions—as well as positions Natives hold—contain opportunities for counter-narratives about Native history to be told. According to Dr. Anderson, this is one powerful way in which these three stakeholders can make a positive impact on the public, the history books, and themselves.

Although the next two informants work outside the geographic confines of this thesis, their research methods provide a worthy model for effective collaboration in archaeology that can be utilized in Southern New England.

Dr. Christina Rieth

Dr. Christina Rieth is the State Archaeologist of New York, and also serves as the director of the Cultural Resource Survey Program at the New York State Museum (NYSM).

Dr. Rieth described the fact that the nature of the relationship between archaeologists and Native communities differs when doing academic archaeology versus cultural resource management. In New York, she described this relationship as being more “collegial” within academic archaeology, because Native representatives are more eager to talk with students participating in field schools about “traditional lifeways, behavioral practices, and their history in the area” (Christina Rieth, McKayla Hoffman, 30 November 2013). This greatly enriches the students’ experience and strengthens the relationship between an archaeologist serving as a principal investigator and the Native community. Conversely, in cultural resource management, there are times in Dr. Rieth’s experience when Natives who are involved do not feel that their

voices are heard in the process. However, Dr. Rieth does not place the blame for this on the archaeologists, but rather on the agencies that employ them (Christina Rieth, McKayla Hoffman, 30 November 2013).

Dr. Rieth's involvement with Native constituents occurred while she served as a cultural resource manager on consultation projects. She worked with tribes prior to excavation, but also during excavation. Native representatives worked with her as monitors during projects, which enabled their voice to be heard at the moment any issue occurred on site. As State Archaeologist, she has issued permits that stipulate involvement with tribes, and does so with emphasis on the fact that these resources will be protected and not simply excavated. Her mindset reflects her empathy towards tribes when it comes to handling their past sensitively, and especially their sacred artifacts and human burials (Christina Rieth, McKayla Hoffman, 30 November 2013).

Dr. Rieth's involvement with local tribes also extends to her work in the museum community. The NYSM has coordinated repatriations under NAGPRA, and they have curated ethnographic collections of Iroquois baskets, beadwork, and other crafts. The level of engagement with local tribes has heightened greatly over the years, even before Dr. Rieth's arrival to the NYSM. They have regularly sponsored behind-the-scenes tours of the museum for tribes, particularly the Mohawk. They also meet with representatives from the Mahicans in the Hudson Valley, and they have worked with groups when loaning collections to other museums, such as the Seneca Museum (Christina Rieth, McKayla Hoffman, 30 November 2013).

One project which Dr. Rieth described to me illustrated her fruitful style of cooperation. Before she began a cultural resource management project in central New York, she invited local Iroquois groups to be involved. They set up a number of meetings before a trowel hit the soil, and she worked with their Native coordinator to set up a methodology for handling any issues

that might arise. It was decided that the groups would be apprised of anything that was found at the site, and that if there were any concerns about burials or sacred objects, those would be dealt with whether the concern occurred within or outside of the field. During one meeting in particular, some Native monitors addressed the research group with questions about disturbing a site versus preserving it. They were given the opportunity to review reports, and they were responsible for giving the final approval for the project to commence. In this case, Dr. Rieth granted the members of the various Iroquois groups agency over the project, and was quite receptive to discussing their concerns and exercising sensitivity towards them, and it was successful regardless of the cultural resource management agency she worked for (Christina Rieth, McKayla Hoffman, 30 November 2013).

Dr. Rieth's methods of effective cooperation consisted of open communication, because "when different sides stop talking and [don't] communicate about the issues, the whole relationship breaks down" (Christina Rieth, McKayla Hoffman, 30 November 2013). While two parties working to cooperate might not always agree, dialogue between the two must continue so that a trusting relationship can be maintained.

Dr. Jordan Kerber

One notable archaeologist who has done extensive collaborative work whom I had the pleasure of interviewing was Dr. Jordan Kerber, the director of Native Studies at Colgate University. He is also a curator at the Longyear Museum of Anthropology at Colgate. Dr. Kerber has had strong public involvement with archaeology, and told me that Natives have been his most important constituents. His collaborative work greatly involved the Oneida Iroquois, the closest Native community to Colgate, from 1995 to 2007.

The project that touched me the most was one he conducted with the Oneida which began in 1995. He approached the Oneida about conducting a project on Woodland period sites and explored the possibility of getting Oneida teenagers involved for a 2 week period. He had no model to follow, and began to create his own model. He made it clear from the start that he would not be excavating human burials, and even though the Oneida were not fans of archaeology at the time, they let the project commence. Dr. Kerber and the Oneida slowly built trust, and as a result, the project successfully continued for three more summers until 1997 (Jordan Kerber, McKayla Hoffman, 9 November 2013).

Of all the aspects of Dr. Kerber's cooperation model, I found it particularly striking that he invited teenage members of the Oneida. If any of those teenagers ever became archaeologists, their involvement in this issue would be invaluable. This experience might allow some, if not all, to learn about the potentially positive impacts that archaeology can have on their tribe. Also, the opportunity for these teenagers to work in as many perspectives as possible might pave the way for greater respect between stakeholders and might allow them to become more active members of their tribe.

When I asked Dr. Kerber about what he thought should happen to make a truly collaborative project, he emphasized the sharing of control when it comes to information and decision-making, and perhaps relinquishing the control to the Native community an archaeologist is working with; if neither party is willing to share control at least for a while, the project should be reconsidered. He also discussed effectively communicating the goals of each party before commencing a project and how collaboration should occur. One interesting fact that Dr. Kerber conveyed to me was that it is difficult for Native peoples to trust non-Native peoples, especially when it comes to handling their past. This is what makes communication important

according to Kerber, because it is then that a relationship built upon mutual respect and honesty can be built (Jordan Kerber, McKayla Hoffman, 9 November 2013).

The next informants conducted research in Southern New England, which reflects the climate of archaeological projects for this geographical area and the need—and increasing prevalence—of collaborative projects.

Dr. Tim Ives

Dr. Tim Ives taught archaeology as an adjunct professor at the University of Connecticut until 2012, when he began his role as the Principal Archaeologist at the Rhode Island Historical Preservation and Heritage Commission (RIHPHC). He is also the State Archaeologist of Rhode Island. He has done most of his collaborative work with Native groups in cultural resource management, who assisted him in conducting walkovers of project areas. He worked for the Mashantucket Pequot's laboratory, and said that "Natives were my co-workers and associates in a setting where people don't really think on the level of who is Native and who is not" (Timothy Ives, McKayla Hoffman, 19 December 2013). When he first started working for the RIHPHC, he realized quickly that collaborative measures were taken whenever possible, and that "collaboration works when people have open communication, and we strive for that ideal" (Timothy Ives, McKayla Hoffman, 19 December 2013). They strive to maintain this communication by not ignoring phone calls or e-mails and by maintaining an approachable demeanor.

When asked to characterize the relationship between Native groups and archaeologists in Rhode Island, he called it collaborative, usually on paper, but also in the field or at a "planning desk" (Timothy Ives, McKayla Hoffman, 19 December 2013). He is pleased that local Native people have become primary consultants when interpreting historical data and studying the past.

In Dr. Ives' view, equal consideration should be given for ethnographic data and evidence from the archaeological record, because they both offer a unique and useful contribution to understanding pre-contact Native American history.

Dr. Ives also placed emphasis upon the importance of keeping locals involved in historic preservation and archaeology, regardless of ethnicity (Timothy Ives, McKayla Hoffman, 19 December 2013). This, he states, can make preservation planners better positioned to achieve their goals. In this way, his perspective is much like Dr. Joyce Rain Anderson's: in making archaeology public, not only does it ensure that any and all possible stakeholders have an opportunity make their voices heard, but it keeps archaeology relevant and makes the public more willing to understand—and possibly even support—historic preservation.

Dr. Arthur Spiess

Dr. Arthur Spiess is the Senior Archaeologist for the Maine Historic Preservation Commission, and has been a Board member for the Maine Archaeological Society for about 25 years. He also serves as the Editor of *Archaeology of Eastern North America* for the Eastern States Archaeological Federation, and has served as the State Historic Preservation Officer of Maine since 1978. Dr. Spiess made strides to work with the Native community early on in his career, at a time when doing so was unpopular. There have been formal agreements to share archaeological survey information with tribes and to work collaboratively with them during archaeological projects (Arthur Spiess, McKayla Hoffman, 20 August 2013).

In Dr. Spiess' experience, the nature of collaboration between Maine's five federally recognized tribes and the professional archaeology community is "quite good" (Arthur Spiess, McKayla Hoffman, 20 August 2013). Dr. Spiess detailed a number of collaborative projects that have occurred in Maine recently. The Passamaquoddy tribe worked alongside professional

archaeologists—notable Dr. Ellen Cowie—on a federally-funded project at the N'tolonapemk site (Arthur Spiess, McKayla Hoffman, 20 August 2013). A portion of research included the collection of Passamaquoddy oral traditions that are relevant to the site, and field work was staffed by archaeologists and tribal members alike.

Dr. Spiess' work with the Passamaquoddy has not been limited to archaeological research; they have also worked together to revise problematic legislation concerning burial or sacred sites. In 1973, Donald Soctomah—the Tribal Historic Preservation Officer of the Passamaquoddy—and Dr. Spiess attended a hearing to present revisions of a bill (22MRSA 2842-B) that resembled NAGPRA. Passed with these revisions, this law ensures that institutions not covered by NAGPRA must repatriate Native American skeletal remains to the Wabanaki Repatriation Committee. The law has been hugely successful in repatriating such remains from private collections and groups like historical societies (Arthur Spiess, McKayla Hoffman, 20 August 2013).

During our interview, I learned that over the course of the last two decades, the State of Maine has made great strides in ensuring that Native groups can make their voices heard. They established a Tribal-State joint commission to work out issues that come up. However, even with this in place, Dr. Spiess explained that their relationship with other state agencies differs widely, especially when it comes to issues related to fish and game, environmental issues, and establishing casinos. Even though their relationship has improved over the last decade, there are still areas in which disagreements continue to occur (Arthur Spiess, McKayla Hoffman, 20 August 2013).

As far as the relationship between Native groups and museums are concerned in Maine, Dr. Spiess explained that they work together actively. The Abbe Museum—which focuses on the

culture and history of the Wabanaki—has a Tribal Advisory Board, which allows Natives to lead exhibit planning and other functions the museum performs. The Hudson Museum at the University of Maine has a similar relationship with the Wabanaki, and features a permanent exhibit displaying baskets, basketmaking tools, snowshoes, beadwork, birchbark containers, three full canoes, and more (Hudson Museum). In this exhibit, they show audio and video of Wabanaki tribal members who describe the process of collecting raw materials, processing the materials, and creating each art form (Hudson Museum).

At the conclusion of our interview, Dr. Spiess discussed the ways in which collaborative relationships can be built most effectively. In his experience, the nature of these relationships must be “person-to-person,” and occurs over the course of many years. He also emphasized the fact that relatively few tribal members care about archaeological research, although decision-makers in tribes tend to care more (Arthur Spiess, McKayla Hoffman, 20 August 2013). The collaborative efforts that are occurring in Maine now, though, are a testament to the dedication of archaeologists and Native tribal members to working side-by-side to preserve and present the past in a responsible format, with Native tribal members often being granted significant authority over each effort.

Dr. Stephen Mrozowski

Dr. Stephen Mrozowski is a professor at UMass Boston and the director of the Fiske Center for Archaeological Research in Boston, Massachusetts. His archaeological career has involved doing colonial archaeology, mill archaeology in Lowell, and over the past decade or so, he has worked collaboratively with the Nipmuc.

Dr. Mrozowski became involved in historical archaeology because, according to him, it “had a lot to do with my not wanting to do the archaeology of Native North America because of

my own feelings of guilt about the whole experience and feeling that archaeologists weren't really involved with helping the folks" (Stephen Mrozowski, McKayla Hoffman, 4 December 2013). He described to me a powerful event he related to me that was a notable example of overt resistance to archaeology on the part of a Native community. There was an Inuit band living in Barrow, a town on the Alaska, and they were not supportive of the work other archaeologists were doing. He learned this first hand when his crew arrived at their research site. An Inuit man pulled out a handgun and demanded to know who they were and what they were doing there. This has a significant impact on Dr. Mrozowski, and after leaving the site, he asked himself: "Why am I here? If I'm not here to sort of help preserve their cultural heritage in that instance from oil development, and they're saying 'What the hell are you doing?', then what am I doing there?" (Stephen Mrozowski, McKayla Hoffman, 4 December 2013). He described feeling guilty because he could not justify the work he was doing. Saddened by this realization, Dr. Mrozowski decided to focus his archaeological research on colonial and mill archaeology in Lowell, because it was easier to be ethical and he enjoyed it.

However, he became inspired by the collaborative work that Dr. Stephen Silliman did over the course of a few years. During the Clinton administration, the Hassanamissett Nipmuc gained federal recognition, but George W. Bush's administration stripped them of it because it was claimed that they could not demonstrate political continuity of their reservation beyond the 19th century. There was a large trust for public land that was going to be developed into condos in Grafton, which was the site of a Praying Indian village. Dr. Mrozowski expressed interest in working with Dr. Rae Gould and Sheryl Holly of the Nipmuc tribe, and knew that this was the tribe he wanted to collaborate with. Due to his experience with the Inuit community in Alaska, it took him quite a while to summon the courage to ask the Nipmuc about collaborating with him

on this project. He finally went to them and said that he wanted to do collaborative archaeology with them, but he would only proceed if they supported it and if they helped him decide how to do it in the most respectful manner possible (Stephen Mrozowski, McKayla Hoffman, 4 December 2013). After working with Dr. Rae Gould and the Nipmuc Tribal Council, they developed a plan that involved constant communication and collaboration on publishing, and soon, they agreed to going through with the project.

The Fiske Center discovered cultural materials after a short investigation, and the town of Grafton was able to purchase the land. Dr. Mrozowski hoped that the site would be used for educational purposes, specifically related to Nipmuc history (Stephen Mrozowski, McKayla Hoffman, 4 December 2013).

The site contained the remains of a house that belonged to the granddaughter of the Hassanamissett sachem, with a rich assemblage of eating utensils, small ceramic sherds, and a collection of faunal remains. Dr. Mrozowski made a significant discovery: the material culture of this site pointed to habitation during the 18th century. This fact would allow the Hassanamissett Nipmuc to re-open a petition for federal recognition. Dr. Mrozowski's collaborative work combined with a political contribution to the Hassanamissett made for an experience he deemed quite personal, in that it cleared up some of the guilt he felt before undertaking this project. He commented on this by saying "If this is the kind of archaeology I'm going to do, it feels good" (Stephen Mrozowski, McKayla Hoffman, 4 December 2013).

He characterized the relationship between archaeologists, Native Americans, and museums as being, at times, a notably positive one. He mentioned that in his work with the Nipmuc, many did not support archaeology initially. Many of them saw archaeologists as "the enemy," and that they were not "interested in knowing Natives as people today, but only in their

history,” and Dr. Mrozowski explained that this comment was probably true of archaeologists at the time even if some did not acknowledge it (Stephen Mrozowski, McKayla Hoffman, 4 December 2013). Over the last decade, however, he has seen a movement of much greater collaboration, and he mentioned the work that Dr. Steven Silliman did with the Eastern Pequot and what Dr. Kevin McBride of the University of Connecticut did with the Mashantucket Pequot. He pointed out that before the 1990’s, archaeologists felt that they were able to celebrate history and bring it back to life with their work, and that now, some Native Americans in Southern New England see archaeology in a similar light (Stephen Mrozowski, McKayla Hoffman, 4 December 2013).

At the close of the interview, Dr. Mrozowski emphasized the fact that not cooperating with Native Americans on archaeological projects that involve them is similar to “going into someone’s house and wanting to investigate them and not speak to them,” and that for this reason, the most logical way of conducting archaeological research is to involve stakeholders greatly, especially Native communities (Stephen Mrozowski, McKayla Hoffman, 4 December 2013).

The following interviewees have written fascinating and illuminating case studies about their experiences in collaboration, which I will also describe in detail.

Dr. Elizabeth Chilton

Dr. Elizabeth Chilton is a professor of anthropology at UMass Amherst, and she previously served as the department chair for six years. She serves as an active mentor for undergraduate and graduate students alike, and has conducted field schools and archaeological projects outside of UMass Amherst. Dr. Chilton is also the Director for the Center for Heritage and Society.

It was during Dr. Chilton's graduate school years at UMass Amherst that archaeology entered the post-processual stage, when the missing voices of Northeastern archaeology's stakeholders began to be noticed, including women and Native people. Before that time, interpretations of the past were dehumanized, even after the feminist archaeology movement of the 1970's, in indigenous archaeology and historical archaeology alike. As far as NAGPRA is concerned, Dr. Chilton expressed the fact that while it was not the only impetus for change for archaeologists, it "tipped them over the edge in a good way."

Dr. Chilton characterized the relationship between archaeologists and Native groups in Southern New England as at a time of critical growth, or "growing pains" in her words. She explained to me that these communities have made great strides for bettering their relationship since the 1980's, and that even though change is "painful" for some, it is necessary and therefore positive (Elizabeth Chilton, McKayla Hoffman, 9 December 2013).

When asked what value archaeology has for the public, Dr. Chilton emphasized the important stories that archaeologists could contribute to. She described the fact that there is a sort of "cultural amnesia" that exists due to erased histories, specifically for Native American history. As a result, certain recent histories are privileged over others, and recent history in general is privileged over ancient history (Elizabeth Chilton, McKayla Hoffman, 9 December 2013). This point is important to consider because "cultural amnesia" affects the ways in which Native communities have been and continue to be perceived. Perhaps this highlights another important aspect of archaeology: that it might be able to clarify the misconceptions of the past due to the decimation and marginalization Natives have suffered since European contact.

Her own collaborative efforts with Native Americans are revealing about the changing tide of archaeology during the 1990's and early 2000's. Dr. Chilton was an Assistant Professor at

Harvard University from 1996 to 2001. When she began her position there, she wanted to start a field school project that would not only be collaborative in nature, but also at a site that was in danger of imminent destruction from construction, erosion, or looting (Chilton 2006: 282). Her goal was to walk students through a collaborative process that directly benefits a community while also preparing them for work in cultural resource management. Brona Simon, the State Archaeologist of Massachusetts, recommended a site in Martha's Vineyard in which the Aquinnah Wampanoag were stakeholders and which was in danger of being destroyed: the Lucy Vincent Beach site. Dr. Chilton worked directly with the Aquinnah's Natural Resources Department (there were no THPOs at the time) to create a research design, and a grant-funded survey of the beach was conducted from August 12th to the 14th of 1997 (Chilton 2006: 284).

Due to the success of this survey, Dr. Chilton wanted to conduct a larger investigation in the form of a field school during the summer of 1998. She was able to secure scholarships through Harvard for two Aquinnah students in order to have a richer collaborative experience for the field school (Chilton 2006: 285). When she was organizing the project, not only did she work with the Aquinnah's Tribal Council, but also with the Board of Selectmen of the town of Chilmark, the Massachusetts Historical Commission (MHC), the Chilmark Conservation Commission, and the Harvard University Summer School (Chilton 2006: 284). In her proposals, she explained the field and lab methods and laid out in detail what would be done in the event that a human burial were discovered. She also worked with the town Board of Selectmen of the Conservation Commission to adjust the field methods to mitigate erosion to the site. During the excavation, there were members of the Natural Resources Department from the Aquinnah tribe who periodically visited to observe excavations, especially due to their concerns about the erosion on the beach (Chilton 2006: 285).

On the final day of the excavation, beneath a hearth feature and some fire burnt rock, a partial human cranium was discovered (Chilton 2006: 286). The excavation unit was backfilled, and Dr. Chilton contacted the Aquinnah and MHC representatives. Dr. Chilton expressed to me that there was a fear that passers-by on the beach might pick up the bones as the beach eroded over time (as had happened in the past). Dr. Chilton explained that many of the Aquinnah did not want to “be a part of asking archaeologists to excavate remains, even to prevent their erosion” (Elizabeth Chilton, McKayla Hoffman, 9 December 2013). However, the only alternative to Dr. Chilton’s team uncovering the remains was Brona Simon sending archaeological teams down every time human remains were exposed. Some members of the Aquinnah Tribe believed that uncovering the remains would interrupt the natural cycle these bones would have otherwise undergone, but understood that they would be in greater danger due to the presence of beach-goers. After a period of discussion among all parties, the remains were recovered during September of 1998, and Dr. Chilton’s team conducted an analysis in the field at a temporary lab, and repatriated all the remains and funerary artifacts to the Aquinnah. Even though Dr. Chilton handled the remains and associated funerary items delicately, it was clear that the Aquinnah were uncomfortable with the entire situation (Chilton 2006: 287).

The discomfort felt by the Aquinnah became even more evident the following summer of 1999, when a second field school was conducted at the site by Dr. Chilton and her team. The *Boston Globe* wrote an article about the site the previous year, drawing a great deal of attention to the site (Chilton 2006: 288). The attention still existed the following year, and there was growing strain among the beach guards, the town, and the archaeological team. Dr. Chilton put together a more detailed proposal outlining the concern about erosion and the importance of this site. She presented the proposal at a Board of Selectmen meeting, and a board member

mentioned that a press representative was there who wanted to write another story. She explained to the press member that they should contact the Aquinnah to get the story approved, and to her great dismay, they did not and printed the story anyway (Chilton 2006: 288). This caused a great deal of stress in the relationship between the Aquinnah and the archaeologists. Dr. Chilton felt as though all the efforts she exerted to create a positive collaborative experience and to honor the responsibilities she had to the tribe, to her students, and to her university were disrupted (Chilton 2006: 288). However, after reclarifying the goals and the priorities of the project, and after much discussion about how to deal with public sharing of information going forward, the Aquinnah once again expressed their support for the project. It is important to highlight the fact that the tribe's concerns and wishes were prioritized, especially in the wake of potentially damaging press coverage.

I asked Dr. Chilton to summarize the most effective methods of cooperation that she has utilized. One important fact that Dr. Chilton learned about collaboration with Native communities is that they might not necessarily have the time to devote to the priorities of archaeologists. Often, they are more concerned with issues pertaining to the day to day operations of tribal matters (economic, social, political, and legislative). It is rare that both groups have the same amount of time to give to each other's priorities (Elizabeth Chilton, McKayla Hoffman, 9 December 2013). Many tribal members feel as though they understand their past just fine, and the help archaeologists offer is not always needed or wanted. Dr. Chilton pointed out something some in the archaeology community might consider surprising: "Sometimes," she explained, "the answer is not to do archaeology" (Elizabeth Chilton, McKayla Hoffman, 9 December 2013). In short, if the stakeholders within an archaeological project simply find it to be unnecessary or more damaging to proceed than the threat endangering it, it

would be wise to reconsider the project entirely. Dr. Chilton made one final notable point, and that was if an archaeologist's goal is to be social justice-oriented in their projects, it is important to utilize their skills in anthropology to assist them, sometimes more than their skills in archaeology.

Ramona Peters

The Wampanoag Confederacy's Repatriation Coordinator Ramona Peters detailed her difficult experience in repatriation consultations in her essay entitled "Consulting with the Bone Keepers: NAGPRA Consultations and Archaeological Monitoring on the Wampanoag Territory" (Peters 2006: 32). The site that she discusses is the same site that Dr. Elizabeth Chilton excavated on Martha's Vineyard; this section will detail the collaborative efforts at this site through Peters' perspective. Unfortunately, I was unable to interview Ramona Peters, so the following represents the perspective she presented in her essay.

Peters experienced great difficulty when attempting to repatriate remains from a site in Martha's Vineyard, where an archaeological field school from Harvard University uncovered the remains of Aquinnah Wampanoag ancestral remains. According to Peters, there were a number of burials falling out of an eroding beach bluff that the field school crew uncovered (Peters 2006: 38). Together with a member of the Aquinnah tribe, Tobias Vanderhoop, and the entire field school, a ceremony was conducted not only for the human remains uncovered, but also the soil matrix, which the Wampanoag Confederacy also wished to be repatriated. Peters was taken aback at the ignorance of the field school students, who did not know the spiritual significance of the biological matter in the soil matrix (Peters 2006: 39).

However, the students were not the only ones ignorant of the spiritual magnitude of the materials to be repatriated. Museum personnel at Harvard University's Peabody Museum of

Archaeology and Ethnology—where the remains of what was found at different sites than the one described above were stored—also did not understand at the time. Peters described the importance of human remains by saying “If my bones are molested and removed from my ancestral homeland, I will probably not be able to return to my loved ones. Reinterment assures the possibility of return” (Peters 2006: 39). Peters met with the NAGPRA consultants at the museum in the hope that she could help them to understand the significance of these remains, but they explained to her that the remains were classified as “unidentifiables” because “no present-day Indian tribe could be considered related to human remains more than one thousand years old” (Peters 2006: 40). Not surprisingly, this unfortunate experience instilled within Peters a negative attitude towards museum personnel and archaeologists—or cultural anthropologists—who do not take the time to consult with members of the Wampanoag community to attempt to understand why it is of the utmost importance for the remains of their ancestors to be repatriated.

However, Peters went on to explain that even though there were issues with NAGPRA early on, there would be vast improvements in its provisions that would be effective in ensuring repatriation, not only for federally-recognized tribes, but also those without such recognition. In 1994, the Mashpee Wampanoags were able to receive NAGPRA-sensitive items from the Robert S. Peabody Museum in Andover, Massachusetts after the first NAGPRA review committee meeting ruled in favor of the Mashpee, even though they were not federally recognized at the time (Peters 2006: 36). Thus, even though NAGPRA was not perfectly written at its onset, there has been gradual improvement to who could receive its benefits.

Dr. Stephen Silliman

Dr. Stephen Silliman is a full professor at UMass Boston, and is the director of their graduate program in anthropology.

Dr. Silliman had a desire to do community-based archaeological projects before it became more common in Southern New England. He began establishing such a project in California, where there was a large population of Mexican-Californians working and living. He wanted to involve them in his archaeological projects because no other archaeologist had before. He described it as being a “good start,” but that it was not sufficient and that he wanted a deeper experience with communities. At the time, he was a graduate student working under his advisor who had done collaborative archaeology since the late 1980’s, before NAGPRA forced archaeologists to attempt collaborative work (Stephen Silliman, McKayla Hoffman, 4 December 2013). He described his advisor’s work as an “archaeology of the present, not just of the past,” which is what he would strive to do with his own students when he became a faculty member at UMass Boston.

Dr. Silliman detailed his extensive work with the Eastern Pequot in his article entitled “Working on Pasts for Future: Eastern Pequot Field School Archaeology in Connecticut”, co-written with Katherine H. Sebastian Dring. They posit that collaborative relationships can be built from foundations other than those established from a required NAGPRA consultation process. The venue for this relationship-building that they focus on exists within what they call a “traditional North American archaeological field school” where there is an emphasis on historical and cultural preservation and not simply NAGPRA compliance (Silliman and Dring 2008: 67). They suggest that histories are not simply created through archaeology, but also through relationships that exist between stakeholders and the social and political context of the present. Conducting community-based indigenous archaeology with a field school allows for the creation of “responsible and useful histories” because it allows undergraduates and graduates to

gain an understanding of the Native perspective by situating themselves in an indigenous archaeology context (Silliman and Dring 2008: 68).

Dr. Silliman conducted this field school at a Pequot War site in North Stonington, Connecticut. The Eastern Pequot Tribal Council expressed interest in creating a formalized cultural and historical preservation effort within their tribe. In light of this interest, they wanted an archaeological survey conducted for their reservation, which took place during the summers of 2003 and 2004 (Silliman and Dring 2008: 71). While archaeological investigations continued in 2005, the Eastern Pequot were undergoing a strenuous political period. The Department of the Interior Board of Indian Appeals rejected their request for federal recognition due to “lack of jurisdiction” (Silliman and Dring 2008: 71). In preparing for their sovereignty, the Eastern Pequot had also expended a great deal of finances, so their rejected request carried extra weight.

Even during this volatile period, the Eastern Pequot were determined to begin a formal cultural and historic preservation on their reservation. Their goal was to learn more about the history of their reservation, and to achieve this, they wanted an archaeological survey done. This paved the way for a collaborative project between Silliman and the Eastern Pequot between 2003 and 2005, in the midst of a continuing battle for federal recognition (Silliman and Dring 2008: 71).

Silliman and Dring (2008) outlined numerous ways in which partnering with an archaeological field school directly benefitted the Eastern Pequot and, for that matter, any tribe with similar political and economic hardships, and especially for those that are non-federally recognized. Firstly, collaborating with university- or college-run field schools gives tribes who cannot conduct archaeological research on their own a means to do so that is not financially straining. Conducting archaeological research with a field school can also be beneficial in that it

can aid in receiving funding for future historic preservation projects. Silliman and Dring (2008: 73) point out that it is also important to make sure the majority of control does not fall into the hands of the “money,” or in this case, the academic institution funding the project.

Secondly, field schools can benefit participating tribes in that it can provide training and education in archaeology to tribe members. Silliman and Dring (2008: 73) mention in their case study that at least two Eastern Pequot tribal members received paid internships to work in various aspects of archaeological investigations, and that the education being received by the university students in a field school is extended to tribal members. This type of educational opportunity (and financial, because of the option for paid internships) cannot exist in contract archaeology, where time restraints and tight budgets impede such options. Receiving an education in archaeology does not necessarily mean that Native peoples must be prepared for a potential career in archaeology; rather, it is argued that this opportunity can allow tribal members to understand archaeological jargon and therefore have a more fruitful collaborative experience with archaeologists (Silliman and Dring 2008: 74).

Silliman and Dring (2008) also discuss the opportunities that academic archaeologists and their students have when they work alongside Native communities. These projects can enable students to have practice communicating effectively with tribal members and understanding the unique nature of the concerns and perspectives they might express to archaeologists. Field school students can also learn about the “culture of archaeological research” which does not merely involve scientific inquiry and excavation, but rather social- and research-oriented methodologies (Silliman and Dring 2008: 77). Also, because the history of any group of people is constructed in the present, there is a complex amalgamation of forces which produce such a history, such as tribe-university relationships, racial tensions, federal

acknowledgment, colonialism, and community concerns (Silliman and Dring 2008: 78). In collaborative indigenous archaeology, university students are given the opportunity to examine these forces and learn to acknowledge their implications for history-building so that the past of Native groups is depicted in the purest way possible.

During our interview, Dr. Silliman described his collaboration with the Pequot as being one where the control of projects often falls into the hands of the tribal governing bodies in a variety of ways. The Eastern Pequots' tribal council authorized the presence of members at a site from their community who ranged in age between six years old and even to ninety years old (Stephen Silliman, McKayla Hoffman, 4 December 2013). A master's student who wanted to work at a site was brought forward before the council, and representatives from the council reported on whether they allowed the student to begin work. The council also decides what interns or visitors are allowed to be present at a site. Their response towards working with Dr. Silliman and his crew was positive overall. Although there was some hesitation about archaeologists working on their land, many members of the Pequot were also quite interested in the work being done. Dr. Silliman was also pleased with collaboration with the Pequot, and so far, nothing negative has come from this experience (Stephen Silliman, McKayla Hoffman, 4 December 2013).

Dr. Silliman described collaboration between archaeologists and Native communities in Southern New England as being on the rise, but certainly not perfect, and that it is one place in the United States where such work is being pushed more than other regions (Stephen Silliman, McKayla Hoffman, 4 December 2013).

In reflecting upon what we spoke about during our interview, Dr. Silliman noted that effective collaboration fundamentally involves not merely communicating concerns to one

another, but remaining open and actively listening to the concerns of stakeholders while taking into account the unique context of the situation; this is the difference between cooperating and consulting (Stephen Silliman, McKayla Hoffman, 4 December 2013). In his experience, collaborating opens us space for ambiguity on who should be involved during what stage of the process, so he advised paying close attention to this step and deciding early on who should be involved at what time. Dr. Silliman notably described members of the archaeological community in Southern New England who think collaborating distorts the scientific process. He argued that archaeology should not only involve hypothesis testing, but should be a self-reflective process and one in which the archaeologist recognizes the implications of the questions they develop in conducting research and how they affect the stakeholders involved. To me, his archaeology was one that was regularly conscientious of others and not just of the research or of the researcher (Stephen Silliman, McKayla Hoffman, 4 December 2013).

Model of Collaboration

In this section, I will outline the following requirements for an effective collaboration model. These were the methods that I selected based upon their effectiveness and the frequency in which my informants discussed them.

1. Communicate concerns, goals, and perspectives early on.
2. Continue to communicate, and do so often throughout the course of a project through formal or impromptu meetings.
3. For archaeologists: consider what tribes might be stakeholders in a project and make it a point to reach out to them before the project commences.

4. Have as many Native and archaeological stakeholders present during excavation as possible so that interpretations can be immediately given and issues can be promptly worked out.
5. Maintain a cross-cultural perspective.
6. Share control of the information, such as what conclusions are met, what information is published, and how artifacts will be treated.
7. Strive to build a relationship outside of what is absolutely required (one based solely on legally-mandated NAGPRA compliance)
8. Partner with museum authorities to use what information has been gained from a collaborative project to educate the public and to dispel myths and stereotypes about a culture or historical event.

Observations

Of the methods outlined in this model, the following were the most prevalent in the discussions with my informants: 1, 2, 4, and 6. Not surprisingly, communication was discussed by all informants. This might reflect the success of and continued need for open dialogue, which was especially evident in the Lucy Vincent island case. I was unable to determine the precise level of involvement Ramona Peters had in this case, so it is difficult to say why Elizabeth Chilton and Ramona Peters described this case in starkly contrasting language. Regardless, it does reveal the fact that either party—or both parties—had concerns about the project that might have been misunderstood, misinterpreted, or not shared at all. This research shows that communication lays the foundation for effective collaboration; without it, any other method might quickly fall apart.

Kenneth Alves, Joyce Rain Anderson, Jordan Kerber, and Stephen Silliman all outlined the importance of sharing control of the information and decision-making in an archaeological project and in a museum context. All of these informants agreed that if the balance of control is compromised, so too is the efficacy of building a trusting relationship between collaborating stakeholders. For example, as Dr. Silliman stated, it is often the case that those who are funding an archaeological project tend to assume the majority control of the project (Stephen Silliman, McKayla Hoffman, 4 December 2013). This is a dangerous trend that, according to this research, seems to be dissipating. Both Kenneth Alves and Dr. Anderson explained that giving the Native community a voice in exhibit design, archaeological field and research methodologies, and what is published, is not only a responsible way of collaborating with them, but can aid in interpreting the past. While distrust might exist among these stakeholders, maintaining the balance of control and allowing each to voice their concerns and opinions equally in a neutral setting can set up a collaborative project with a foundation built with respect and trust.

I also found that it was difficult to place my informants into three limited stakeholder categories. During my research, I found that I had to change the nature of my questions for certain informants because they fit into two or even all three of the stakeholder categories. For example, when interviewing Rae Gould, I realized that my prepared questions divided her into three separate, seemingly unrelated roles: as an archaeologist, a member of the Nipmuc tribe, and a museum official. As I quickly learned, the nature of interaction between these stakeholders did not consist of three separate parties holding steadfast to ideologies that neatly fit into the confines of their group. Rather, in my perception, these groups can be more closely described as a highly interconnected whole who often share ideas about how a collaborative project should be conducted. It is this interconnectedness that fuels collaborative projects.

Conclusions

Politics certainly does not make for an enjoyable experience, and usually invokes feelings of frustration in anyone involved. It is understandable that many wish to avoid political situations in their careers, and archaeology is no exception. Archaeologists often—and with good reason—view their work as being significant to history-building. Even though it might be easier for an archaeologist to focus on their research, its completion, and its publication, many stakeholders exist who must be acknowledged by the archaeological community. For this reason, I argue that archaeologists cannot remain stagnant in their practice. The only reason archaeology is perceived as being increasingly political is that the views and methodologies of all the stakeholders involved do not necessarily align. However, this research demonstrates that this fact is changing, because preserving the past for the future is an overarching goal that archaeologists, museum authorities, and Native communities share. Cooperation is possible, and is necessary, to keep up with the changing discipline of archaeology, and might become a universal hallmark of the discipline in years to come.

References

American Antiquities Act of 1906.

U.S. Department of the Interior. National Park Service. 16 U.S.C 431-433.

American Indian Movement.

American Indian Movement – GGC Profile. “What is the American Indian Movement?”

<http://www.aimovement.org/ggc/index.html>

"American Indian Religious Freedom Act."

2010 NativeNet: Training, Education, and Resources in Tribal Governance and Law.

University of Arizona. Accessed 26 Mar. 2014.

Atalay, Sonya

2006 “Indigenous Archaeology as Decolonizing Practice.” *American Indian Quarterly*.

30 (3&4): 280-310.

Cornell University Law School.

n.d. “Lyng v. Northwet Indian Cemetery Protective Association.” *Legal Information*

Institute – Supreme Court. <http://www.law.cornell.edu/supremecourt/text/485/439>

Downer, S. Alan.

1997 *Native Americans and Archaeologists: Stepping Stones to Common Ground*.

Walnut Creek: AltaMira Press, Print.

Ferguson, T. J.

1999 “NHPA: Changing the Role of Native Americans in the Archaeological Study of the Past.” *Society for American Anthropology Bulletin* 17 (1).

<http://www.saa.org/Portals/0/SAA/publications/SAAbulletin/17-1/SAA24.html>

Hudson Museum

University of Maine – Hudson Museum. “Exhibits.”

<http://umaine.edu/hudsonmuseum/exhibits/>

Irwin, Lee

1997 “Freedom, Law, and Prophecy: A Brief History of Native American Religious Resistance.” *American Indian Quarterly* 21 (1): 35-55.

Jemison, Peters G.

1997 *Native Americans and Archaeologists: Stepping Stones to Common Ground*.

Walnut Creek: AltaMira Press, Print.

National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA)

U.S. Department of the Interior. National Park Service. 16 U.S.C. 470

Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA)

U.S. Department of the Interior. National Park Service. Public Law 101-601; 25 U.S.C. 3001 et seq.

NPS Archeology Program

Archeology Program. “National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA).”

<http://www.nps.gov/archeology/tools/Laws/NHPA.htm>

Peters, Ramona L. Kerber, Jordan E., ed.

2006. “Consulting with the Bone Keepers: NAGPRA Consultations and Archaeological Monitoring on the Wampanoag Territory”. *Cross-Cultural Collaboration: Native Peoples and Archaeology in the Northeastern United States*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press. Print.

Stephen W. Silliman and Katherine H. Sebastian Dring.

2008. "Working on Pasts for Futures: Eastern Pequot Field School Archaeology in Connecticut" Collaborating at the Trowel's Edge: Teaching and Learning in Indigenous Archaeology. Ed. Stephen W. Silliman. Tucson: University of Arizona Press. Print.

Timreck, Ted, dir.

2012. *Great Falls: Discovery, Destruction and Preservation in a Massachusetts Town*. Prod. Ted Timreck and Peter Frechette. Hidden Landscapes. DVD-ROM.

United States Department of Justice

Environmental & Natural Resources Division. "Lead Up to the Indian Claims Commission Act." <http://www.justice.gov/enrd/3147.htm>

Vecsey, Christopher

1991 *Handbook of American Indian Religious Freedom*. New York, NY: Crossroads, Print.